



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

HC

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/927,022 09/10/97 KIRSCH

S INF-009

EXAMINER

LM02/0120

THOMAS SCHNECK  
P O BOX 2-E  
SAN JOSE CA 95109-0005

RONES, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2771

8

DATE MAILED:

01/20/00

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
08/927,022

Applicant(s)

KIRSCH

Examiner

Charles Rones

Group Art Unit  
2771



☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Nov 15, 1999

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

## Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

## Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some\* ☒ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2771

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response***

1. The response timely filed on November 15, 1999 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
3. Claims 1-8 & 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Schloss (5,706,507).
4. As to (amended) claim 1, Schloss discloses:
  - a. one or more web servers having electronic versions of documents available by request where content servers are deemed to be document servers; See Figs. 1-2;
  - b. a search engine having access to access control lists for documents on the web servers, the access control list linking authorized users with all documents permitted for each authorized user, whereby documents found in a search are screened with the list to determine the documents for which a user performing a search has access; See Figs. 3-4, 5C, 7 & 11; Abstract; 5:45-67; 6:1-67; 7:1-25; 8:40-54.

Art Unit: 2771

5. Schloss discloses the claimed invention except for wherein screening is done at the web server. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the screening at the web server since it was known in the art that computing an operation as the server where it is requested and returning the result is faster and more efficient than providing a response which must then be computed at the client.

6. As to claim 2, the modified invention of Schloss discloses:

a. means for forwarding to the user only those document titles compatible with the authorized access of the user; See Abstract; 7:1-25; 8:40-54.

7. As to claim 3, the modified invention of Schloss discloses:

a. a communications link between a query server connected to the search engine; See Figs. 1-2; and

b. access control lists (advisory servers) associated with the web servers; See Figs. 1-2.

8. As to (amended) claim 4, the modified invention of Schloss discloses:

a. executing a query on a query server having access to a document index of documents available for searching on document servers provided in the web site by a person having a unique identification code without regard to access control limitations, yielding a list of all relevant documents having a unique URL wherein it is deemed that persons having a unique id for access

Art Unit: 2771

during the time blocked periods would also use the system as described for other access; See Figs.

4 & 9B; Abstract; 4:1-21; 11:1-55; 7:1-25;

b. reviewing all URLs by the document servers after the search is executed using an access control list associated with each document server to check whether each URL is compatible with the access level of the identification code of the person executing the query wherein parents and children are deemed to have different access levels, See Abstract; 11:1-55; and

c. delivering only those documents whose URL is compatible with the access level of the person; See Abstract; 7:1-25; 8:40-55.

9. As to claim 5, Schloss discloses:

a. providing a data link between the query server and access control lists for associated web servers wherein the access control list is deemed to be on the advisory server; See Figs. 1-2, & 6; 4:57-67.

10. As to claim 6, Schloss discloses:

a. storing the access control list separately from the index of documents wherein the index of documents are deemed to be on the content server; See Figs. 1-2 & 6; 5:1-52.

11. As to claim 7, Schloss discloses:

Art Unit: 2771

a. storing the access control list separately from the index of documents wherein the access control list is deemed to be on the advisory server and the index of documents is deemed to be on the ; See Figs. 1-2 & 6; 2:37; 4:47-67; 5:1-52.

12. As to claim 8, Schloss discloses:

a. implementing access control with partial URLs indicating the hierarchy of documents to which a person with a unique identification code has access wherein a fuzzy match is deemed to be a partial URL; See 7:5-44.

13. As to claim 11, Schloss discloses:

a. wherein a single access control list is provided for all document servers wherein it is deemed that one access (advisory) server can be used for all document servers; See Figs. 1-2; 5:1-67; 6:1-67.

14. As to claim 12, Schloss discloses:

a. wherein an access control list is provided for each document server wherein it is deemed that an access server can be provided for each document servers (content server); See Figs. 1-2; 5:1-67; 6:1-67.

Art Unit: 2771

15. Claim 9-10 & 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schloss '507 in view of Kirsch US Patent (5,751,956).

16. As to (amended) claim 13, Schloss discloses:

a. providing a plurality of document servers in the web site, each having an association with a unique URL, each document server having an access control list defining user identification and for each user identification listing URLs for which access is permitted or denied wherein each document server's access control is deemed to be an access server (advisory server); See Figs. 1-2;

b. executing a query on a query server having access to a document index of documents available for searching on the document servers by a person having one of said identification codes; See previous responses;

c. producing only those documents whose URL is compatible with the access level of the identification code of the person; See previous responses.

17. As to claim 13, Schloss discloses the claimed invention except for the determining by one of the document servers whether each URL is compatible with the access level of the identification code of the person. Kirsch teaches that it is known to determine by one of the document servers whether each URL is compatible with the access level of the identification code of the person. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2771

invention was made to determine by one of the document servers whether each URL is compatible with the access level of the identification code of the person as taught by Kirsch, since Kirsch states at column 7, lines 60-67 and column 8, lines 1-46 that such a modification would allow the server to identify inappropriate repeated submissions of the URL to the server.

18. As to claim 14, Schloss discloses:

a. wherein the URLs are expressed in HTTP protocol; See 4:30-56.

19. As to claim 15, Schloss discloses:

a. wherein each access control list lists URLs for each user identification number with a hierarchical indication of documents for which access is permitted or denied wherein the URL is deemed to provide a hierarchical indication of documents; See 5:40-67; 6:1-67; Figs. 4, 5C, & 9B.

20. As to claim 16, Schloss discloses:

a. wherein hierarchical indication is by partial URLs; See Figs. 4, 5C, & 9B; 7:1-44.

21. As to claim 17, Schloss discloses:

a. accessing the access control list by the filesystem of the query server; See Figs. 1-2 & 4; 5:1-67; 6:1-67.



Art Unit: 2771

22. As to claim 18, Schloss discloses:

a. accessing the access control list by a file transfer protocol wherein HTTP is deemed to be a file transfer protocol and the browsers also have a file transfer protocol; See 4:1-67.

23. As to claim 19, the modified Schloss discloses the claimed invention except for confirming access to the access control list by a script message from a document server. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to confirm access to the access control list by a script message from a document server since it was known in the art that restricting access usually provides a message when access is restricted and providing a message when access is successful for the purpose of informing the user of his/her accessibility to data is helpful to the user when restricting access.

24. As to claim 9, Schloss discloses the claimed invention except for implementing access control with a common gateway interface script. Kirsch teaches that it is known to implement access control with a common gateway interface script as set forth at column 2, lines 49-67 and column 3, lines 1-65. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement access control with a common gateway interface script, as taught by Kirsch in order to allow a small program to be executed by a server in response to a client URL request.

Art Unit: 2771

25. As to claim 10, the modified invention of Schloss discloses:

a. wherein said common gateway interface scripts returns a message to the query server indicating URLs to which a person with a unique identification code has access; See Kirsch:28-67.

***Response to Arguments***

26. Applicant's arguments filed on November 15, 1999 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

27. Firstly, Applicant argues that Schloss allows users to control the access while Applicant does not.

28. In response, Examiner maintains that Schloss discloses such and also Schloss discloses wherein a gateway functions as a firewall to restrict access to content servers for authorized users; See 4:7-19.

29. Secondly, Applicant argues that the present invention utilizes server-based architecture to determine access while Schloss does not.

Art Unit: 2771

30. In response, Examiner maintains that in a client/server environment, servers and clients can be interchanged. Schloss discloses a client/server architecture, therefore it is inherent that Schloss can function as claimed.

31. Thirdly, Applicant argues that it would not have been obvious to create the present invention in view of Schloss.

32. In response, Examiner maintains reason for obviousness.

33. Fourthly, Applicant argues that the present invention prohibits displaying URLs while Schloss allows the user to block access once it is requested.

34. In response, Examiner maintains that Schloss discloses restricting access to URLs and that prohibiting the display of URLs has not been claimed.

35. Lastly, Applicant argues that Kirsch relates to accessing the validity of the referred webpage and other information and only applies to providing access to the server itself.

36. In response, Examiner maintains that checking the validity of URLs would restrict access where the URLs and other information were deemed invalid.

Art Unit: 2771

***Conclusion***

37. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for response to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the date of this action. In the event a first response is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event will the statutory period for response expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

38. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles Rones whose telephone number is (703) 306-3030. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black, can be reached on (703) 305-9707.

Art Unit: 2771

**Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

**Box AF**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED  
PROCEDURE")

**Or:**

(703)308-5403 (for informal or draft communications, please label  
"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive,  
Arlington, VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Application/Control Number: 08/927,022

Page 13


Art Unit: 2771

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



Rones

January 6, 2000



THOMAS G. BLACK  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 2700